REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 106-145 were pending in this application.

Claims 106-114, 116-124, 126-134, and 136-144 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schein et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0196201 (hereinafter "Schein") and Young, U.S. Patent No. 5,353,121 (hereinafter "Young").

Claims 115, 125, 135, and 145 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein in view of Goldschmidt Iki et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,226,444.

Applicants' Reply to the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejection

Claims 106-114, 116-124, 126-134, and 136-144 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schein. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention, as defined by independent claims 106, 116, 126, and 136, recites providing a user with a list of selectable options (see, e.g., FIG. 4 and page 10, lines 12-21 of applicants' specification). The list of selectable options includes a first selectable option for accessing information for broadcast programs (e.g., program listings option 51 of FIG. 4), and a second selectable option for accessing a list of recorded programs stored on a digital storage device (e.g., media directory option 53 of FIG. 4). In response to the user selecting the first selectable option, the user accesses information for at least one broadcast television program and at least one recorded program stored on the digital storage device (see, e.g., FIG. 5b, page 14, lines 3-6, and page 14, line 24 to page 15,

line 3). In response to the user selecting the second selectable option, the user accesses a list of recorded programs stored on the digital storage device (see, e.g., FIG. 9 and page 21, line 16 to page 22, line 4).

Schein describes a program guide that allows the user to change "the mode of the television schedule system" (see Schein, paragraph 51). FIG. 6B of Schein discloses a "Mode Menu," which includes a "program guide" option and a "recordings" option. The Examiner contends that FIG. 6B of Schein shows applicants' claimed options. Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the options of FIG. 6B provide access to information for at least one broadcast television program and at least one recorded program stored on the digital storage device. While the "program guide" option provides access to information for scheduled program listings, this option does not provide access to information for recorded programs.

Thus, FIG. 6B of Schein fails to teach or suggest providing a list of selectable options, where one option allows the user to access information for at least one broadcast television program and at least one recorded program stored on the digital storage device, as required by the applicant's claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also contends that claims 106-114, 116-124, 126-134, and 136-144 are anticipated by features of Young, which is incorporated by reference in Schein.

Young describes a television schedule system.

FIG. 4 of Young shows a pending recordings menu that includes an "On Grid Prog" option that provides access to scheduled

broadcast programs and a "Recorded Programs" option that provides access to recorded programs. The Examiner contends that these options show applicants' claimed options.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Neither of these two options provide access to both broadcast programs and recorded programs.

Thus, in the same way that FIG. 6B of Schein fails to show or suggest applicants' claimed invention, FIG. 4 of Young also does not show or suggest providing a list of selectable options, where one option allows the user to access information for at least one broadcast television program and at least one recorded program stored on the digital storage device.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 106, 116, 126, and 136 are patentable over Schein and Young. Accordingly, each of dependent claims 107-115, 117-125, 127-135, and 137-145 is also patentable at least because it depends, directly or indirectly, from a patentable independent base claim. Accordingly, the rejections of dependent claims 107-115, 117-125, 127-135, and 137-145 should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration in light of the foregoing remarks and a favorable action are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Maxine Lee

Registration No. 61,495

Agent for Applicants

ROPES & GRAY LLP

Customer No. 75563